

SNAP who can work actually do work. They come home when their shift ends and count pennies because the average benefit is only a couple of bucks.

I am sick and tired of Republicans coming down to the floor and going on social media to beat up on poor people. Members of Congress are not on SNAP. Do you know who is? Children, seniors, veterans, people with disabilities.

For the record, there is a special place in hell for those who want to take food out of the mouths of vulnerable Americans.

#### HONORING SIX NORTH CAROLINIANS WHO DIED IN PLANE CRASH OFF THE COAST OF CARTERET COUNTY

(Mr. MURPHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart.

Today, we honor six North Carolinians who died in a plane crash off the coast of Carteret County on the 13th of February 2022. Four days from now will be the 1-year anniversary of this horrific tragedy.

Last March, we held a moment of silence in their remembrance. No words can describe the pain and devastation that our community has felt. Yet, I continue to be moved by the outpouring of love and support from individuals not only across North Carolina but this great Nation.

Today, I am introducing legislation with the entire backing of the North Carolina delegation to designate six creeks in Carteret County after six of the individuals who lost their lives.

My bill, the Down East Remembrance Act, gives exact latitudes and longitudes as to the creeks' locations. They will be named after Noah Styron, Hunter Parks, Kole McInnis, Stephanie Fulcher, Jacob Taylor, and Daily Shepard.

Upon adoption, these names will become part of the fabric of eastern North Carolina.

May God bless them and their families and give them peace.

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MICHAEL N. MOSTEIT

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Michael N. Mosteit.

Mike was a trailblazer in the labor movement, a dedicated public servant, and a loving family man.

As a member of IBEW Local 66 for over 50 years, he strived to ensure our workers had fair representation and proper wages.

I had the honor of standing shoulder to shoulder with Mike many times—de-

fending workers, organizing, walking the picket line, winning, and sometimes trying and trying again.

The work was never about the money. It was about fighting for the quality of life and transformational difference a good job can do for a family.

That is what leadership is: wanting something better for others than you have for yourself. That was Mike Mosteit.

Our hearts go out to his loving wife, Carol, a wonderful educator in her own right, and their son, Joshua.

Rest in peace, Mike. We will keep up the fight until we meet again on another picket line. God bless.

#### CELEBRATING BLACK BUSINESS OWNERS

(Ms. BROWN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today ahead of National Entrepreneurship Week and during Black History Month to acknowledge and celebrate the remarkable contributions of Black business owners.

Entrepreneurship drives economic growth and creates jobs, yet too few Black businesses have the capital and connections to start and scale successful companies, contributing to the racial wealth gap through entrepreneurial inequity.

Here are the facts. Of the 6 million employer businesses in the U.S., just 130,000 are Black owned, barely more than 2 percent.

My district's entrepreneurs are helping drive our region and Nation's economy forward, and I will share their stories as we celebrate Black Americans' past and present achievements.

That includes people like Kanisha Harwell, owner of Balance Cheer and Gymnastics in my hometown of Warrensville Heights. Kanisha started her gym after experiencing the lack of support for diversity in gymnastics, taking on multiple jobs to fund the creation of an inclusive environment for Black athletes.

Minority entrepreneurs are a vital asset to our economy, and I urge my colleagues to work with me to build a more equitable economy for all.

#### COMMEMORATING LIVES TAKEN DURING THE HENRY PRATT SHOOTING

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the lives taken during the Henry Pratt shooting in Aurora, Illinois, nearly 4 years ago.

On February 15, 2019, gun violence stole the lives of five innocent people and injured six police officers when a person who should not legally have had a gun opened fire in a workplace.

Unfortunately, this is a reality that we are all too familiar with as Americans. Throughout our Nation, in every State, gun violence continues to claim innocent lives. These victims are our family members, our friends, and our neighbors. We must do better.

I am proud that Congress came together in the last year to pass the most significant piece of gun violence legislation in nearly three decades, but more must be done.

We cannot wait for the next tragedy. We must continue to pursue commonsense gun safety measures that will keep guns out of the wrong hands and help save lives.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with the Aurora community during this time of remembrance and reflection.

#### SUPPORTING OUR YOUTH TODAY

(Ms. SCHOLTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of our kids. It is so important that we come together alongside the next generation of Americans and give them the resources they need to succeed in a 21st century economy.

There are so many issues facing our youth today. Between the mental health crisis, rising costs of education, and childhood hunger, our children are dealing with issues that can and must be addressed by Federal lawmakers.

Mental illness is on the rise among the next generation of Americans. We are witnessing an unprecedented increase in depression, anxiety, substance abuse, and suicide.

We are in the middle of a crisis. Mental health concerns are American parents' top concerns for their children, and the pandemic just exacerbated already troubling trends.

Working families matter. Our kids matter. There is so much opportunity to come together across partisan divides and address these critical issues.

This week, I have been meeting with school board members and college officials from my district. They are ready to partner with us to improve the lives of our students.

I am here for the next generation of west Michiganders. We owe it to our kids to address these critical issues through commonsense solutions that work for them.

#### DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE REVISED CRIMINAL CODE ACT OF 2022

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 97, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 26) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARL). Pursuant to House Resolution 97, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 26

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Congress disapproves of the action of the District of Columbia Council described as follows: The Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022 (D.C. Act 24-789), enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia on January 17, 2023, and transmitted to Congress pursuant to section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act on January 27, 2023.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debated for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

□ 0915

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of Representative CLYDE's H.J. Res. 26, a resolution disapproving the District of Columbia's Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022.

There is a crime crisis in America's Capital City. According to the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department, carjackings in the District have increased by 90 percent compared to this time last year. Total property crime is up 31 percent, and homicides are up 29 percent. In fact, D.C. is currently on track to have the most homicides since 1995.

But the radical D.C. Council has chosen to prioritize legislation that will turn this crime crisis into a catastrophe. The D.C. Council's progressive soft-on-crime legislation eliminates almost all the mandatory minimum sentencing requirements for violent crimes, and it drastically reduces the maximum penalties allowable to the courts. These changes further embolden criminals to run rampant throughout the District of Columbia.

The act also grants the right to a jury trial for most misdemeanor offenses. The D.C. court system is already overloaded. This change will burden the D.C. court system even more, reducing the resources devoted to hearing cases for serious felony offenses.

The D.C. Council's legislation is eroding an individual's right to a fair and speedy trial granted them through our Constitution.

All Americans should feel safe in their Capital City, but they don't because of D.C. Democrats' leniency toward criminals at the expense of Americans' safety.

Ensuring public safety and addressing crime is a cornerstone of the House Republicans' policy agenda. In November of last year, Americans voted for a new majority in the House—a new majority that will address crime head-on to ensure a nation that is safe.

This D.C. Council legislation is a brazen rejection of law and order. Ignoring the high rates of criminality in the District and doubling down on leniency for society's violent criminals is a dereliction of duty. This terrible policy will impact anyone who sets foot in the District of Columbia, including residents, the commuting workforce, Federal Government officials, foreign dignitaries, and Americans visiting their Nation's Capital.

If the D.C. Council wants to continue to skirt its responsibility to the people, then they will have to answer to this Congress.

It should be noted that we in Congress are not alone. The D.C. Police Union, representing 3,500 members, and the National Fraternal Order of Police are strongly in favor of H.J. Res. 26 stating in a recent letter to Congress that the D.C. act "will embolden criminals, dramatically increase crime and violence, and render police officers in the District of Columbia virtually powerless to adequately police the city and keep its residents and visitors safe."

This resolution is also endorsed by the National Association of Police Organizations representing over 241,000 law enforcement officials across America and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association.

Additionally, on January 4, Washington, D.C., Mayor Muriel Bowser took the extraordinary step of vetoing this legislation, calling the proposals controversial and stating that the act does not make the District of Columbia safer.

Mayor Bowser's bold executive veto sent a strong message that the policy proposals of this bill are simply unworkable and unsafe for the District. There may not be much Mayor Bowser and I have agreed on in the past, but today we are on the same page.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting Mr. CLYDE's resolution disapproving of the D.C. Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022. We must ensure these terrible criminal code reforms are not put into place.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 26, the second episode in the new miniseries where the House majority asks the United

States Congress to act as a super city council of 535 members to make decisions for the people of Washington, D.C., which is a real city with a real city council and Mayor and which some of my colleagues apparently have never visited or had any real interaction with.

The people in Washington, D.C., want to make their decisions about democratic self-government for themselves. They don't want the Representatives of other Americans to come and make decisions for them.

President Biden was here this week for his great State of the Union Address, and, Mr. Speaker, when you could hear him over the heckling, he talked about the great progress we are making as a nation economically with 12 million new jobs.

In terms of support for Americans in their healthcare with the dramatic reduction in healthcare prescription drug costs, we have cut to \$35 a month what people have to spend on their insulin shots if they have diabetes.

We just passed a record investment in climate preparedness to deal with the extreme climate emergency and all of the extreme weather events that people in the United States are experiencing across the country.

That is a national agenda. That is a real national agenda.

Now, my friends across the aisle want to spend this week instead supervising and reviewing the bills that are being passed by the D.C. Council for 713,000 American citizens who live in Washington, D.C.

Yesterday, it was about voting rights. Today, it is about criminal justice reform. I am sure down the road, just as in the past, it is going to be their gun safety laws, and it is going to be their laws allowing for Medicaid funded abortions for poor women. Then they will go after their LGBTQ laws and so on. There will be a parade of attacks on local democratic self-government in Washington, D.C.

Now, I believe that the people of Washington should be treated like all other American citizens. Right now what they have asked for is admission to the Union as a State.

Now, most of the Members of this body represent States that were admitted after the original 13. Thirty-seven States came in afterwards with Congress' exercise of its Article IV powers to admit new States. That was very much the design of the Constitution and the Founders' plan. Go back and read some Thomas Jefferson about that.

We were not set up as a country where certain people would make decisions for other people but people, instead, would be able to govern themselves. In fact, the basis of our attack on British rule over America was our rejecting the idea of virtual representation: that some people could make decisions for other people. No. The whole premise of American democracy is that people make decisions for themselves.

So the 713,000 taxpaying, draftable citizens of Washington, D.C.—whose population has participated in every war America has ever fought from the point of the American Revolution to the Civil War and all the way up through the recent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq—those people are asking for admission to the Union.

This House of Representatives in the 117th and the 116th Congresses voted to give it to them. It didn't quite make it through the Senate, which is always slower on these things, but that is the trajectory that the people of D.C. are on.

Instead of trying to join President Biden and all of the great national economic progress, infrastructure progress, and healthcare progress we are making, the House majority decides instead to usurp the role of the D.C. Council and to begin to micromanage their government and finger paint all over their laws. That is what they are doing today.

Now, we don't have time to compare the laws of D.C. with the laws of each of the other States, but I just want my colleagues to be on notice that I have got the laws of the other States, and I can do those direct head-to-head comparisons.

I don't think we should go down this road. I don't think it is a healthy thing for us to be doing as a Congress because we should be respecting the democratic self-government rights of the people of Washington, D.C.

Nobody is more interested in public safety in Washington than the people of Washington.

Nobody is more interested in the processes of democratic self-government in Washington than the people of Washington.

Nobody is more interested in their healthcare policies and in their housing policies than them.

I invite any of my colleagues who have actually been to a meeting of the D.C. Council or their local advisory neighborhood commission to rise and tell us about the experience.

But if they haven't, then they should leave democratic self-government and local self-government of Washington to the people of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, it appears my Democratic colleagues would rather disregard their statutory responsibility in the Home Rule Act. How convenient to pick and choose when to do their duty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) who is the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman COMER, for yielding.

It is no secret that crime has beleaguered Washington, D.C., for years. Yet, in the midst of rising crime rates in D.C., our Nation's Capital is now on track to become even more dangerous.

The D.C. Council is advancing a severely misguided bill, the Revised

Criminal Code Act, to eliminate minimum sentences and reduce maximum penalties for numerous violent criminal offenses.

This legislation isn't just reckless. It is radical. Washington's own Democratic Mayor Bowser vetoed the legislation telling the council: "This bill does not make us safer."

Well, for once, I agree with the Mayor because eliminating mandatory minimum sentences for all crimes except first-degree murder, eliminating life sentences, and reducing maximum penalties for violent crimes including burglary, carjacking, and robberies will undoubtedly embolden criminals and threaten the safety of both residents and visitors here in Washington, D.C.

But ultimately, the D.C. Council ignored Mayor Bowser's valid concerns and overrode her veto.

Many have asked why, as a Congressman from northeast Georgia, I am leading the effort to block the D.C. Council's radical rewrite of Washington's criminal code.

It is because I care, and I would expect and hope that everyone here in this Chamber would care, too. Congress has the responsibility and the authority to take this action.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution grants Congress the authority to "exercise exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever, over such District."

But we don't just have a constitutional obligation to stop this soft-on-crime bill from becoming law, we also have a moral obligation to protect America's safety and security in our Nation's Capital City.

Just 2 days ago in his State of the Union Address, President Biden said right here in this very Chamber: "We have an obligation to make sure all our people are safe," and adding: "Public safety depends on public trust."

For once, I agree with the President because all Americans deserve to visit our Nation's Capital without facing fear or violence, and all Americans should be able to trust public officials to implement policies that protect their safety and well-being.

Yet, under the D.C. Council's radical crime bill, residents, small businesses, constituents, and our own staff here on Capitol Hill will inevitably encounter additional danger and violence.

As the President delivered his State of the Union Address on Tuesday night, there was a shooting blocks away in the Navy Yard and a stabbing over in Georgetown.

Earlier this week on Capitol Hill, a Capitol Hill reporter's wheels were stolen right off his car. The same crime happened to one of my Democrat colleagues, Congresswoman BARRAGÁN, last month.

Just last week at the Potomac Avenue Metro station, a crazed criminal shot and killed a 64-year-old Metro mechanic, Robert Cunningham, who heroically attempted to stop the violent criminal from shooting a woman nearby.

Clearly, crime after crime is on the rise here in D.C., yet the D.C. Council's bill will only make matters worse.

Combating crime is not a conservative or a liberal objective. It is not Republican or Democrat. It is simply a commonsense one. In fact, it has been my honor to work with a local Democrat, Denise Krepp, who formerly served as an Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner here in D.C. For years Ms. Krepp pleaded with Democrats to be tough on crime for the sake of the residents she served, yet she was routinely ignored.

In a letter sent to this very body in December—which I shall include in the Record—she urged Congress to introduce a resolution of disapproval to block the D.C. Council's Revised Criminal Code Act. It is an effort I am honored to lead and an effort that I am proud the House will pass today.

Because we must send a clear message to the Senate, to the White House, and to the American people that the people's House rejects soft-on-crime policies that jeopardize Americans' safety and security, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yea" on my commonsense resolution, H.J. Res. 26.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the December 12, 2022, letter from Ms. Krepp.

DECEMBER 12, 2022.

Re. B24-0416—Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022.

Rep. PELOSI,  
Washington, DC.

Rep. MCCARTHY,  
Washington, DC.

Senator SCHUMER,  
Washington, DC.  
Senator MCCONNELL,  
Washington, DC.

REPRESENTATIVE PELOSI, REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTHY, SENATOR SCHUMER, AND SENATOR MCCONNELL: My name is K. Denise Rucker Krepp and I'm an Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner in Washington, D.C. I'm writing to you today to ask that you enact into law a joint resolution disapproving the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022 (RCCA). The bill hurts victims of violent crime.

Currently, convicted rapists must serve their full prison sentence. The RCCA creates a new right to petition for early release from prison. The D.C. Councilmembers who drafted this provision call it proportionate, balancing the interests of victims and those who commit the crimes.

Rape is an irreversible crime. Victims don't get to rewind the clock and as a locally elected D.C. official I respectfully ask that you disapprove the bill, stopping it from becoming law.

Additionally, I respectfully ask that you conduct oversight over prosecutions of violent crimes occurring in Washington, D.C. At a March 2022 meeting, the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia told me that he didn't know what crimes his office prosecutes each year and that it is unreasonable for me to expect him to know this information.

I've been a locally unpaid, no staff elected official in Washington, D.C. for eight years. Over this period of time, I've tracked the murders, armed carjackings, assaults, robberies, stabbings, shootings, and rape that have occurred in my single member district. The U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia has staff and resources, and it's reasonable for him to know what crimes his office

prosecutes. Please ask him to do so and to share this information with you and DC residents.

Thank you.

K. DENISE RUCKER KREPP,  
ANC6B10 Commissioner.

□ 0930

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia says he is in favor of the resolution because he cares about Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), someone else who cares about Washington, D.C.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this profoundly undemocratic, paternalistic resolution.

The House of Representatives, in which nearly 700,000 District of Columbia residents have no voting representation, is attempting to nullify legislation enacted by D.C.'s local legislature, whose members are elected by D.C. residents.

By scheduling this vote, I can only conclude that the Republican leadership believes that D.C. residents, a majority of whom are Black and Brown, are either unworthy or incapable of governing themselves.

The dictionary defines democracy as "a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections." D.C.'s lack of voting representation in Congress and Congress' plenary authority over D.C. are the antithesis of democracy.

I remind House Republicans that they once professed support for local control of local affairs. Their fiscal year 2016 budget said this: "America is a diverse Nation. Our cities, States, and local communities are best equipped and naturally inclined to develop solutions that will serve their populations, but far too often local leaders are limited by numerous Federal dictates."

The legislative history and merits of the legislation enacted by the District of Columbia that are the subject of this resolution are irrelevant to the consideration of this resolution, since there is never justification for Congress nullifying legislation enacted by the District, but I would like to set the record straight.

The Revised Criminal Code Act comprehensively revises D.C.'s criminal code, which has not been done since it was created in 1901. Everyone in the D.C. legal system agrees that such a revision is long overdue. The bill is the product of over a decade of work by D.C. to create a modern, comprehensive, systematic criminal code. A majority of States, both red and blue, have adopted such a code.

In 2016, D.C. enacted legislation establishing an independent agency, the Criminal Code Reform Commission, to recommend a new criminal code. The Commission, which consisted of non-partisan experts, drafted the Revised

Criminal Code Act over nearly 5 years in a fully public process. The voting members of the Commission's advisory group, including the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, unanimously approved transmitting the bill to the D.C. Council and the Mayor.

The D.C. Council held three hearings on this bill. The council, as required by Congress, passed the bill on two separate occasions by votes of 12-0 and 13-0. The Mayor vetoed the bill. The council overrode the veto by a vote of 12-1. The provisions of the bill do not take effect until October 1, 2025, at the earliest.

I say to every Member of Congress: Keep your hands off D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "no."

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the work he is doing.

Mr. Speaker, a healthy Republic has two basic duties: Guarantee free and fair elections, and protect life, liberty, and property from violence.

Yet, two new acts from the Washington, D.C. Council will dilute the vote of American citizens and endanger city residents and visitors. Today, the House of Representatives will vote to stop these acts from taking effect. I urge all my colleagues to support these resolutions.

Let me start with the voting resolution. Last year, Washington, D.C., passed a law that would give the vote to illegal immigrants. The law makes no exceptions for foreign diplomats or agents who have interests that are the opposite of ours. Under this bill, Russian diplomats would get a vote and Chinese diplomats could get a vote.

The CCP is already infiltrating our culture, our farmland, and our skies, but the D.C. Council will let them infiltrate our ballot boxes. Just today, we had a classified briefing for all the Members of Congress talking about what the CCP just did last week over the skies of America, and now the D.C. Council wants to open up the ballot boxes for the CCP.

Even The Washington Post opposes this idea because, as they wrote, it would allow an "estimated 50,000 non-citizen residents" who live in Washington, D.C. to cast ballots in local elections. These elections, of course, can set the laws that cover the White House, Congress, and even government agencies. If we set this precedent, other cities will follow, and faith in our elections will plummet.

Now, let me address the crime resolution. To date, early in this year, early in February, there now have been 65 carjackings in Washington, D.C., just this year alone. That is more than one every single day.

Two weeks ago, two 18-year-old carjackers crashed into two Capitol Police vehicles just yards from this floor.

The suspects were quickly arrested by the Capitol Police. Tragically, carjackings, shootings, and other crimes have become a reality of everyday life in our Nation's Capital.

In 2020, Washington, D.C., defunded the police. From that point on, the city government has done nothing but pass laws that have clearly made the city less safe. Today, many residents are worried about taking their kids to school or going to the grocery store.

Rather than attempt to fix the problem, the D.C. Council wants to go even easier on criminals. Their dangerous new criminal code softens penalties for violent crimes like assault, carjacking, rape, and even most types of murder.

If enacted into law, criminals would be treated like they are victims, and victims would be treated like they don't matter. Even liberals like The Washington Post Editorial Board and Mayor Bowser are against it. In fact, Mayor Bowser vetoed the new law last month. According to the Mayor, the law sends the wrong message to criminals and does not make us safer.

By overriding the Mayor's veto, the D.C. Council advanced the interests of radical activists at the expense of those who are forced to suffer the consequences. This is not fair. It is not right, and it must stop.

Under the Constitution, Congress, not the D.C. Council, has the final say over the laws governing the Nation's Capital. We have a responsibility to hold Washington, D.C., accountable and stop the new criminal code from taking effect.

This is exactly what this resolution does, Mr. Speaker. It is about more than just numbers. This is about our neighbors who are traumatized, injured, and have to live in fear. It is about parents who worry about whether it is safe to let their children play outside. It is about our constituents and students on school trips who might choose to stay home rather than visit their government in person.

That is why the men and women in blue support this resolution. The Fraternal Order of Police supports it; the D.C. Police Union supports it; the National Association of Police Organizations supports it; and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers' Association supports it.

You would think the D.C. Council would listen to the concerns of cops on the beat. They didn't, but Congress will. We will always back the blue, and we will always work to make our communities safer.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have put some stuff on the floor, and I will answer it.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia invoked a couple of crimes in Washington, D.C., including one in the Metro. He didn't talk about the hundreds of crimes that were committed here at the Capitol, in Congress, in Washington, D.C., because he viewed

the events of January 6 as akin to a "normal tourist visit."

Now he dares to lecture the people of Washington, D.C., about keeping Washington, D.C., safe. He seeks to associate Washington, D.C., with crime. Indeed, he and his colleagues constantly try to link images of crime to what they call Democrat-controlled cities.

I did some research last night just to clarify matters. The seven States with the highest murder rates in 2020 all were States that were majority for Donald Trump in the 2020 election. The murder rate in the States that voted for Trump was higher in aggregate than the murder rate in the States that voted for Biden in each year from 2000 to 2020. I invite the gentleman not to lecture the people of Washington, D.C., about crime rates because the murder rate is worse in the red States than it is in the blue States.

Five of the ten cities with the highest murder rate through the first half of last year were in States that voted for Donald Trump in 2020. All those cities have higher murder rates than Washington, D.C. Among the top 10 is a city in the State represented by the sponsor of the disapproval resolution, Mr. CLYDE.

Now, the Speaker rose to talk about both yesterday's resolution and today's resolution. He also gave the people of Washington, D.C., a lecture about diluting the vote when he rejects their admission to the Union as a State.

In other words, he is trying to squelch and nullify their statehood drive that would give them real political equality in the country, and then he says the people of Washington, D.C., are diluting the vote. Well, he is blocking the vote. He is preventing the vote for people in Washington, D.C.

Then he joins the chorus denouncing crime in Washington, D.C., which is suddenly of concern to them. I had not heard them mention that before. Well, it turns out that Bakersfield, California, has one of the highest crime rates in America, recently described as one of the top 10 deadliest cities in America for its size, and its crime rate is higher than that of Washington, D.C.

However, we are going to take this opportunity to kick around the people of Washington, D.C. Why? Because they are vulnerable, because they don't have voting representation in the House, and they have no voting representation or voice in the U.S. Senate. That is a scandal from the standpoint of democracy.

Instead of trying to solve that problem, my colleagues, instead, want to use the people of Washington, D.C., as a whipping post, as a pinata, something to kick around. I just think that that is outrageous, and it is wrong.

On January 6, when we were attacked at the Capitol and in this Chamber, there were hundreds of residents of Washington, D.C., who work for the Capitol Police, who work for the Metropolitan Police Department, who work for other police forces who came

here to defend us. They came to defend the Congress that they are excluded from. You talk about patriotism, that is patriotism.

These people have a real grievance, a valid grievance, not an imaginary, fake, counterfeit grievance like a Presidential election which they still claim Donald Trump won, even though their arguments were rejected in more than 60 Federal and State courts.

□ 0945

Trump lost that election by more than 7 million votes, 306-232 in the electoral college. I am glad they are nodding over on that side of the aisle because these facts are indisputable, yet, still, they indulge the follies and the fantasies and the pathologies of Donald Trump.

That is what they do instead. They try to kick around the people of Washington, D.C., who defended us as patriots on that day.

There are veterans in Washington, D.C., and we will submit these for the RECORD, who have demanded their voting rights and demanded admission as a State. Yet, they dare to lecture the people of Washington, D.C., about what to do with their democratic rights.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I feel compelled to respond. These resolutions have been called paternalistic. However, the last time Congress passed a joint resolution of disapproval was all the way back in 1990, my senior year in high school—I am 50 years old, Mr. Speaker—over 30 years ago.

Congress does not act upon D.C. legislation unless it is absolutely necessary, and that is what we are faced with today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the joint resolution that would help protect the citizens of Washington, D.C., and prevent violent criminals from being let free to terrorize folks and reoffend.

Even Mayor Bowser, by no means a conservative or moderate, was adamantly opposed to the Revised Criminal Code Act. She vetoed it. It is no wonder why she vetoed this measure. So far, year to date, according to the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D.C., has seen a 90 percent increase in auto theft, a 143 percent increase in sex abuse, and a 29 percent increase in homicides. On the whole, year to date, property crime is up 31 percent and overall crime is up 23 percent.

That doesn't sound like a recipe for doing away with mandatory minimums, lowering maximum sentences, and increasing rehearings for violent criminals.

In New York State, we have seen the impacts of these soft-on-crime policies. In New York City, total crimes were up 22 percent in 2022 from 2021 and over 47

percent from 2020, the year that cashless bail took effect.

It is alarming; it is startling; and it is a preview of what is to come in Washington, D.C., if we do not stop this radical measure that was passed from going into effect.

Cashless bail in New York was the single stupidest policy that has ever been enacted anywhere. Forty percent of those who have been released on nonmonetary bail for felony offenses have been rearrested. Judges do not have judicial discretion.

New York State is the only State in the country that does not have a dangerousness standard. There is non-enforcement of petty crimes in New York City. There has been elimination of the anticrime unit, which is primarily responsible for getting illegal guns off the streets. They have raised the age where 16- and 17-year-olds are tried in family court rather than criminal court, yet using guns in the commission of a crime, they are being released. Is it any wonder why gangs would use them?

Unrepentant cop killers, child rapists, and murderers are being released by an out-of-control parole board. There is a radical defund the police movement. This has happened in New York City, and it will happen in Washington, D.C., if this law is allowed to go into effect.

The greatest responsibility of any government is to ensure the safety and security of its citizenry. Cities like New York and now Washington, D.C., and Chicago are failing in their responsibility.

We are putting our citizens and law enforcement at risk. It needs to stop. This law should not be allowed to go into effect, and Congress has an obligation—an obligation—to act.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about crime in D.C., so I think it is fair to ask: How do the Revised Criminal Code Act penalties compare to the penalties in the States, the States represented in this House? I will cite a few examples from Kentucky, Chairman COMER's home State.

The Revised Criminal Code Act has a higher mandatory minimum penalty for murder one than Kentucky.

The Revised Criminal Code Act has a higher maximum penalty for involuntary manslaughter and unarmed robbery than Kentucky.

How about armed and unarmed carjacking? The Revised Criminal Code Act has specific armed and unarmed carjacking crimes. Kentucky does not.

The Revised Criminal Code Act maximum penalty for armed carjacking is higher than for first degree robbery in Kentucky. The Revised Criminal Code Act maximum penalty for unarmed carjacking is higher than for unarmed robbery in Kentucky.

How about felony murder? The Revised Criminal Code Act has a maximum sentence of 20 years with a maximum of 30 years for aggravating factors. Kentucky abolished felony murder.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has just made a very powerful point, which is that on a whole range of offenses under the newly revised D.C. act that they want to overthrow, the criminal law is tougher in Washington, D.C., than it is in the distinguished chairman's home State of Kentucky.

On carjacking, on first degree murder, on involuntary manslaughter, the people of D.C. have chosen tougher penalties, but the gentlewoman didn't arrive to denounce Kentucky as soft on crime or weak on crime and say the whole United States Congress has to turn itself into a superlegislature for Kentucky and strike their laws down. That is up to the people of Kentucky. They don't even have a carjacking statute. You have to use armed robbery there, which gets you up to 20 years in prison. In the District of Columbia, they have a specific carjacking statute that could get you 24 years in prison.

That is the beauty of the Federal system, which I thought our colleagues supported, the idea that people decide at the local level whether they want tougher laws, as in the District of Columbia, or weaker laws, as in Kentucky. That is up to the people of the States to go offense by offense.

I am afraid that my friend and colleague, Ms. NORTON, is taking them a bit too seriously because they are not really interested in scrutinizing the actual criminal justice policy. They just want to kick the people of Washington, D.C., around. They want to lord it over them.

We have President Biden here this week inviting both parties to work together for a continued acceleration of this great economic rebound we are in with 12 million new jobs, with us finally addressing climate change, with us finally getting prescription drug benefits to the people of America. He invited us to participate in a bipartisan national renewal, and what does the majority come back with? They want 535 Members of the United States Congress to act like a super-city council lording over the people of Washington, D.C.

It is unjust and unfair to the people of Washington, and it is beneath our dignity as a democratic Congress to be acting in this way.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I am pretty sure we haven't had a carjacking in my congressional district in several years. If someone thought about carjacking a vehicle in my district, it probably wouldn't end well for them. I don't think this has anything to do with this important bill in a city that

has been ravaged with crime and carjackings every day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO).

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in staunch opposition to the disastrous new criminal justice reform act passed by the D.C. Council.

If enacted, the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022 would effectively prevent the local justice system from keeping criminals off of our streets, all while D.C. grapples with a crime wave.

You see, sir, this is not a lecture. As a matter of fact, I spent a career proudly wearing the uniform. I have stood the line between good and evil. I have interrogated criminals. I have consoled victims.

In Washington, D.C., from February 2022 to February 2023, homicides have increased 17 percent; motor vehicle theft is up 76 percent; total property crime is up 24 percent. Every crime has a victim. Every victim has a story.

Instead of working to stop crime, the D.C. Council chooses to eliminate mandatory minimum sentences for all crimes, except first degree murder, as part of the RCCA.

This misguided legislation also reduces maximum penalties for violent crimes such as burglaries, carjackings, and robberies.

The D.C. Council is empowering criminals, empowering criminals at the expense of the public, which is why I stand in absolute opposition to their newest soft-on-crime plan.

To say that we are targeting the people of D.C., using them as "pinatas," how do you think the victims feel? Sadly, this procriminal agenda has found its way into many other American cities and States, including my home State of New York.

In fact, the D.C. law mirrors New York State's disastrous cashless bail laws implemented by New York State Democrats. Cashless bail allows criminals to commit crimes and be back out on the streets in record time to commit more crimes and wreak havoc on more victims.

We have seen it recently in my own district, where illegal immigrants robbed a store, were released without bail, and failed to report to their court date afterward.

This progressive playbook on justice reform endangers the public, treats criminals with kid gloves, and poses a serious risk to the future of American cities and, most importantly, our Nation's Capital.

Instead of enabling criminals to escape punishment for their crimes, we should empower judges and juries to impose responsible penalties for crimes committed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, we owe it to the people of Washington,

D.C., and the people of the United States of America who live in fear of crime to fight criminals instead of working to protect them.

We must stop the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022 from becoming law.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. If you google carjacking in Kentucky, what will come up is, just a few months ago, two people were carjacked in different incidents at gunpoint in Louisville, which I think is in the State of Kentucky. Since we are talking about State laws, that is what should be relevant. Carjacking is, obviously, a problem across the country.

The conceit of the other side seems to be that they care more about crime and public safety in Washington, D.C., than people who live in Washington, D.C. We just got lectures from two different Members from New York about the terrible conditions in New York. Well, if that is what their concern is, then they should run for the New York State Legislature and change the laws that are involved if they can persuade their fellow citizens that they have it right. If they can't, then maybe they should reconsider what their agenda is.

In any event, if you want to micro-manage the laws of Washington, D.C., and rewrite this 275-page act that was passed to revise the criminal code, which they hadn't revised in a century, with the input of Federal and local judges, prosecutors, public defenders, and the D.C. Council, then move to Washington, D.C., and run for D.C. Council.

□ 1000

These resolutions of disapproval come to the House floor without the benefit of a single hearing in the Oversight Committee.

They have not had a hearing where the Members of Congress could be heard on this, where we could have a single witness, where we could have a single fact introduced, much less have the members of the D.C. Council—who sent a letter petitioning for respect for democratic self-government in D.C.—had the right to be heard, much less if the Mayor had the right to be heard.

They keep invoking the name of the Mayor of the District of Columbia who said she does not want Congress to be overturning the laws of the District of Columbia, even if she opposes those laws.

Well, that is a principled position in favor of democratic self-government. I dare say, most of the Members of this body would say even if they disagreed with a law passed by their State legislature in their State and signed by the Governor that Congress should not selectively overturn that law. But that is precisely what they are proposing to do to the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.



Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from more than 100 groups led by D.C. Vote calling on Congress to keep its hands off of D.C.

FEBRUARY 7, 2023.

Majority Leader CHARLES E. SCHUMER,  
Washington, DC.

Minority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL,  
Washington, DC.

House Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
Washington, DC.

Minority Leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP:

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY OUT OF THE DISTRICT  
OF COLUMBIA'S LOCAL AFFAIRS

We, the undersigned organizations, representing millions of Americans from across the country, are concerned about the numerous measures that have been introduced that will unjustly undermine critical local decisions made by the people of the District of Columbia and their elected leadership. These local laws were enacted to address important local concerns, most notably criminal justice reform, reproductive freedom, democracy and equal treatment under the law. Efforts by members of Congress to impose legislative "riders" or pass disapproval resolutions usurp the prerogative of the District of Columbia's elected mayor and council and the residents they represent.

We also urge Congress to refrain from taking action that could threaten the District's Local Budget Autonomy Act. The Act allows the District to spend local tax dollars based on its local budget at the beginning of the new fiscal year. The DC Superior Court has ruled the Act is valid, and the DC Council and mayor are proceeding with the District's local budget in accordance with the law.

We understand that some in Congress are still seeking to use the legislative process to impose policy riders upon the people of the District. The undersigned organizations advocate on diverse issues and are united in our opposition to the inclusion of any legislative vehicle that overrides, limits or otherwise usurps locally elected decision-making by the District of Columbia.

Already, in just the first month of the new Congress, legislators have promised or introduced measures that takes away the fundamental right to self-governance from the people of Washington, DC.

Congressional interference in these local matters is unfair and intolerable.

Right now, Americans are debating important issues in communities throughout this country. But what is not up for debate is who gets to decide these questions. DC's locally-elected leadership should decide what is best for the people of the District of Columbia.

The Mayor of the District of Columbia and the DC Council were elected by DC residents to represent their interests. Congress does not impose its views on any other local jurisdiction, and Americans in DC have no vote in the Congress to cast against this egregious and increasingly relentless attack on their local democracy. We expect Congress to be consistent by letting District residents manage their own affairs without interference or meddling.

We urge you to respect local autonomy and oppose any efforts that seek to force Congress' views upon DC residents.

Sincerely,

DC Vote; 51 for 51; ACLU; ACLU of DC; All Souls Church Unitarian; American Family Voices; American Federation of Government Employees; Anacostia Coordinating Council; Bend the Arc; Jewish Action; Better Organizing to Win Legalization; Black Voters Matter Fund; Blue Future; Capital Stonewall Democrats; Center for Common Ground; Cen-

ter for Popular Democracy; Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington (CREW); Clean Elections Texas; Clean Water Action; Coalition on Human Needs; Common Cause; Common Defense; D.C. Affairs Community of the District of Columbia Bar\*; DC Committee to Build a Better Restaurant Industry; DC Democratic State Committee; DC Development Disabilities Council.

DC Environmental Network; DC Fiscal Policy Institute; DC for Democracy; DC Jobs With Justice; DC League of Women Voters; DC Marijuana Justice; DC Statehood Coalition; DC Statehood Green Party; Death with Dignity; Defending Rights & Dissent; Democracy for America Advocacy Fund; Democratic Messaging Project; Drug Policy Alliance; East Area Progressive Democrats (EAPD); Economic Policy Institute; End Citizens United/Let America Vote Action Fund; FairVote; Family Values @ Work; Federation of Community Associations; Friends of the Earth U.S.; GLAA; GLSEN; Greenspace USA.

Harriet's Wildest Dreams; Health in Justice Action Lab, Northeastern University HIPS; Human Rights Campaign; In Our Own Voice; Indivisible; Indivisible Chicago Alliance; Indivisible Marin; Indivisible MN03; Indivisible Northern Nevada; Indivisible Santa Fe; Jean-Michel Cousteau's Ocean Futures Society; Justice Policy Institute; Lake Research Partners; Lawyers for Good Government (LAGG); League of Conservation Voters; League of Women Voters of the United States; Legacy DC; LONG LIVE GOGO; Love Huntsville; Metro Washington Council, AFL-CIO; More Than Our Crimes; National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Council of Jewish Women; National Disability Rights Network (NDRN); National Employment Law Project; National Immigration Law Center.

National Organization for Women; National Partnership for Women & Families; National Women's Law Center; Neighbors United for DC Statehood; Netroots Nation; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; Northridge Indivisible; Oregonizers; Our Revolution; Peace Action; People For the American Way; Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington, DC; Plymouth Area Indivisible; Progressive Democrats Of America; Public Citizen; Public Justice Center; Rachel Carson Council; SEIU; SEIU 32BJ; Sojourners; SPACES In Action; Stand Up America.

Statehood4DC; Take on Wall Street, a project of Americans for Financial Reform; The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; The Workers Circle; United Church of Christ, Justice and Local Church Ministries; United Democratic Women; United Nations Association of National Capital Area; Venice Resistance; Veterans United for DC Statehood; Voices for Progress; Voto Latino; Washington AIDS Partnership; Washington Parks & People; Washington, D.C. Lawyer Chapter of the American Constitution Society; Who Speaks For Me; Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

\*The views expressed herein are presented on behalf of the D.C. Affairs Community, a voluntary association of individuals, most but not necessarily all of whom are members of the D.C. Bar. The D.C. Bar itself made no monetary contribution to fund the preparation or submission of this statement. Moreover, the views expressed herein have been neither approved nor endorsed by the D.C. Bar, its Board of Governors, or its general membership.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to cite examples of increased max-

imum penalties in D.C. You can't call D.C. soft on crime.

For example, nonconsensual sexual conduct, which is the most commonly charged sex event, current maximum, 6 months. New maximum, 2 years.

Attempted murder, current maximum, 5 years. New maximum, 23.5 years.

Attempted sexual assault, current maximum, 5 years. New maximum, 15 years.

Threats to do bodily harm, current maximum, 6 months. New maximum, 2 years.

Possession of a machine gun, sawed-off gun, or ghost gun, current maximum, 1 year. New maximum, 4 years.

It increases the maximum penalties for misdemeanor and felony assault on a police officer.

I would like to cite examples of new crimes. Negligent homicide, maximum penalty is 4 years. The current law does not criminalize negligently causing the death of another, except by operating a vehicle.

Reckless endangerment with a firearm. The maximum penalty is 2 years for firing a gun in public, even if the gun is not aimed at anyone or any property.

I urge the Members to look at how the D.C. Council has enhanced penalties, not reduced them, making this city safer for everyone.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we were actually to pass this resolution of disapproval against Washington, D.C., at this point, I wonder what my colleagues think we do at that point.

Sitting as the super council for the District of Columbia, would we rewrite the law?

In other words, would we then conduct hearings on each of the offenses that the gentlewoman has just invoked?

Are we going to have hearings about involuntary manslaughter and first degree murder and carjacking and so on in the District of Columbia?

They don't even want to have a hearing on their disapproval resolution, much less do we want to have a hearing on each of these bills and take over the governance of the District of Columbia.

Let's respect the Home Rule Act that was adopted in 1973. Home rule operates here just like it operates in all of our States, which is local matters are decided locally. Let's leave it at that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Kentucky, the chairman of the Oversight Committee, for yielding.

I also thank Congressman CLYDE for bringing H.J. Res. 26, the bill to address this serious problem of crime.

You have been hearing this debate on the floor. I am sure people watching at

home are watching in amazement that this is not a unanimous discussion, that we are not all standing up here on the House floor deploring the crime that is out of control in the District of Columbia.

We have seen it in so many communities around America. You see it in so many big cities—pretty much all run by Democrats, I will point out—where crime is out of control after they have dropped penalties for criminals, where they have defunded the police, this massive shift against law enforcement, against keeping communities safe. You would think we would all be in agreement on that.

The fact is that in D.C., sexual abuse is up 157 percent. You would think you would hear the other side joining us in speaking out against that, not trying to defend laws that make it easier to get criminals out of jail.

Motor vehicle theft up 88 percent. Total property crime up 31 percent. Homicides increased 22 percent.

We see stories of carjackings every day, and what did the D.C. Council do?

They passed a resolution to get rid of mandatory minimums on many violent crimes.

This isn't some petty crime we are talking about. We are talking about violent crimes. Armed carjackings. The mandatory minimum used to be 15 years for an armed carjacking; dropped to zero. Not a day.

You can hold somebody up at gunpoint and take their car from them, and you could literally walk out of jail the next day without serving a day in prison, and you wonder why crime is out of control. The D.C. Mayor vetoed the ordinance; the council overrode it.

Now, you hear a lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talking about why is Congress even doing this?

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, just the other day, we actually spent a day reading the entire United States Constitution on the House floor.

Maybe my Democrat colleagues didn't listen to that discussion. Maybe they haven't read the United States Constitution in a long time, but I will break the copy out. It is easy to read.

Article I, Section 8 talks about the District of Columbia. It says, "Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District. . . ."

Yes. Congress is given the exclusive right to legislate in all cases dealing with the District of Columbia.

You can talk about debates that go on in statehouses. The District of Columbia is not a State for a lot of reasons.

Our Founding Fathers actually wanted a Capitol of the United States that wasn't part of a State. There is a lot of debate about why that happened.

In fact, this land that we are standing on right now used to be part of a State. The State is called Maryland. It is still there.

Maryland gave land to the United States because our Nation decided we

wanted the Capitol to be in a place that is not tied to the other States, that is just the home of the Nation's Capital.

It gave Congress in the Constitution the authority to get involved in these kinds of issues.

It doesn't happen often, but my God, if we can't come together with crime out of control, with people being killed, with criminals being let out the next day after violent crimes are committed, and mandatory minimums are dropped from 15 years to zero, if you hold a gun to somebody's head and carjack them, that is why we are coming together, to take a stand.

Everybody can vote. If they are okay with letting the carjacks walk scot-free, they will have that opportunity.

Don't count me in that number. I would say don't count the people that live in the District of Columbia, living in fear of crime. They don't want that crime.

The millions of people that come as tourists to visit our Nation's Capital should not live in fear of that violent crime every day because criminals get to walk free.

How is the governance determined?

They allow people that are here illegally to vote in D.C.

We have another bill that we are bringing up to say that people here illegally cannot vote in D.C. elections.

It is bizarre, listening to the debate on the other side that wants to defend that ability for illegals. We went and verified. There is not even an exception for foreign nationals.

So people that work at the Chinese Embassy, we saw how they respect our laws in the United States. They flew a spy balloon over most of the sensitive military bases of our Nation last week.

Yet, people that work at the Chinese Embassy are Chinese citizens and can vote in D.C. elections. There is a piece of legislation that repeals that, as well.

Obviously, there are some in this Chamber who want to defend the right for people here illegally, including people that work for the CCP that are Chinese nationals, that are Russian nationals, they want them to be able to vote in D.C. elections.

Enough is enough. We are exercising our constitutional right to say no to this madness. Let's restore law and order. Let's stand up for law and order and the people of the District of Columbia and all the millions of people who come to visit this Nation's Capital who don't want to live in fear, who don't think that the carjacks should be able to walk scot-free if they pull out a gun and put it to somebody's head to take their car or to break into their house or to do so many other violent things that are causing fear through our communities.

We can do something about this. We ought to do this. We ought to pass both of these pieces of legislation. I urge passage.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am ready to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to correct just a few of the major distortions that we just heard from the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

First of all, carjacking, as I understand it from this act, and I am willing to stand corrected, is not legal in the District of Columbia. On the contrary, it could be punished by up to 24 years.

I think the gentleman from Louisiana misunderstood my colloquy with the chairman of the committee because it is in Kentucky where carjacking is not a statutory offense.

If you were to charge the people who were committing carjackings recently in Louisville, you would have to charge them under armed robbery because there is not a carjacking statute.

Washington, D.C., has one, and it has a penalty of up to 24 years, which is more than you could get in Kentucky for armed robbery.

The second point is he said that crime was out of control in Washington, D.C. Well, the crime rate is higher in Bakersfield, California, which is represented by the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

A major city, New Orleans, in the gentleman's home State, in this quote from FOX News "New Orleans closes 2022 with sky-high homicide rate not seen in decades: 'Horrific.'" New Orleans was given the grim distinction of murder capital of the U.S. in September.

But we don't need to have some kind of race to the bottom Olympics in terms of which State or which city has the worst crime rate.

We should get together to deal with the problem of gun violence, which is why I invite our colleagues to join us and more than 90 percent of the American people who support a universal violent criminal background check, but they oppose it.

They are locked in the stranglehold of the NRA, and they won't back this, despite the fact that all the police unions they cited today about D.C. support a universal violent criminal background check.

Why don't they do something about semiautomatic assault weapons on the streets of our cities and towns across America?

They won't do it. No, they would rather use crime simply as a political club to try to take away other people's democratic rights.

Mr. Speaker, it is scandalous, the way the majority purports to stand up for local self-government and home rule when they want to trample all of the democratic rights of the people of Washington, D.C.

Let's not sit as a super city council of 535 Members doing the municipal minutiae of the people of Washington. Let them govern themselves.

We should be on the pathway to statehood for them, but at the very least, respect their right to home rule. Nobody cares more about public safety in D.C. than the people of D.C.

Nobody cares more about the condition of their communities than the



people who live in them. That is a basic precept of democratic ideals.

I hope my colleagues will respect that, and I hope everyone will vote to reject this continuing series of disapproval resolutions against the people of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD four letters of support for this resolution, letters from the D.C. Police Union, National Fraternal Order of Police, National Association of Police Organizations, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association.

DC POLICE UNION,

Washington, DC, February 6, 2023.

Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY,

House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER MCCARTHY: I am writing as Chairman of the Fraternal Order of Police, Metropolitan Police Department Labor Committee, D.C. Police Union ("D.C. Police Union") and on behalf of the nearly 3,500 members of the D.C. Police Union regarding in support of the disapproval resolution regarding a dangerous law that the D.C. Council has passed that will embolden criminals, dramatically increase crime, and render police officers in the District powerless to adequately police the City.

On January 17, 2023, the D.C. Council overrode Mayor Muriel Bowser's veto of the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022 (the "RCCA"). The RCCA eliminates mandatory minimum sentences for all crimes, drastically reduces the maximum penalties for crimes such as carjacking, and eliminates accomplice liability for felony murder. The provisions in this bill will create lawlessness, prevent police from holding criminals accountable, and increase the number of officers who leave the department.

THE RCCA ELIMINATES MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCES AND DRAMATICALLY REDUCES STATUTORY MAXIMUM SENTENCES

The RCCA eliminates all mandatory minimum sentences in the District and dramatically reduces the statutory maximum sentence which may be imposed for nearly all crimes. This reckless legislation brings the District into uncharted and dangerous territory. Indeed, the Council has conceded that "no U.S. jurisdiction has entirely eliminated mandatory minimums." Despite this, the Council has persisted in its irresponsible encouragement of lawlessness in the District. The RCCA promotes crime by eliminating the certainty of punishment for offenders through the elimination of mandatory minimums while simultaneously stripping judges of the ability to impose a punishment that matches the severity of the offense through the dramatic reduction in statutory maximums.

ELIMINATION OF ACCOMPLICE LIABILITY FOR FELONY MURDER PROSECUTIONS

Section 22A-2201 of the RRCA eliminates accomplice liability for felony murder prosecutions in the District. Accomplice liability for felony murder is critical in establishing liability across multiple perpetrators when evidence is otherwise unable to prove which perpetrator committed the "lethal act." By eliminating accomplice liability, the RCCA ensures that police and prosecutors will be unable to hold the most violent and dangerous criminals accountable.

REDUCTION IN PENALTIES FOR CARJACKING

The RCCA dramatically decreases the penalties for carjackings, despite the fact that

carjackings have spiked in the District over the past two years. The RCCA endangers District residents and encourages lawlessness by reducing the penalties for carjacking offenses. Doing so also removes a critical degree of discretion from judges who, previously, were given proper latitude to craft a punishment that fit the severity of the crime.

REQUIREMENT OF MPD OFFICERS TO UNDERGO AN INDETERMINATE AMOUNT OF EXTENSIVE TRAINING

The sweeping changes to the criminal code in the RCCA will require D.C. police officers to receive extensive training and learn and entirely new criminal code in the District. The extensive retraining and overtime that will be required comes at a time when the number of officers in the District is at historical lows as a result of anti-police legislation passed by the Council. The RCCA will undoubtedly take a further toll of D.C. police officers and accelerate the current exodus of officers from the District.

This anti-police, pro-crime law will create a mass exodus of police officers from the District and will unquestionably make the District of Columbia more dangerous for citizens who live in the District, individuals who work in the District, and tourists that travel to the District. As a result, the D.C. Police Union strongly urges the House Oversight and Accountability Committee to take all action necessary to prevent this reckless legislation from becoming law.

Respectfully,

GREGGORY PEMBERTON,  
Chairman, D.C. Police Union.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,

Washington, DC, February 6, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,

Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES,

Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. STEVEN J. SCALISE,

Majority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. KATHERINE M. CLARK,

Minority Whip, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES JEFFRIES, SCALISE, AND CLARK: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.J. Res. 26, a resolution disapproving the adoption of the Revised Criminal Code Act (RCCA) of 2022 by the Washington, D.C. City Council.

The union representing the men and women of the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) is proudly FOP and the officers we represent have made it clear to us and to the residents of the city that the RCCA will embolden criminals, dramatically increase crime and violence, and render police officers in the District of Columbia virtually powerless to adequately police the city and keep its residents and visitors safe.

On January 17, 2023, the D.C. Council overrode Mayor Muriel Bowser's veto of the RCCA. Mayor Bowser, like the men and women of the MPD recognize that it will quickly have a negative impact on public safety in the District. The RCCA eliminates mandatory minimum sentences for all crimes, drastically reduces the maximum penalties for crimes such as carjacking, and eliminates accomplice liability for felony murder.

These so-called "reforms" have been implemented in other jurisdictions and have led inevitably to greater violence and crime across our country. Having it happen here, in

our nation's capital, will have a ripple effect and we are very concerned that other cities will model their reforms on laws like the RCCA.

To reduce the authority of law enforcement officers and erect numerous obstacles to effective prosecutions and just sentences in the middle of a national crime epidemic is at variance with common sense! It is also contributing to the recruitment and retention crisis in the District and around the nation. In the last three years, more than 500 officers have left MPD and many cite their terrible treatment by the City Council as the reason for their departure.

We urge the House to adopt H.J. Res. 26 and disapprove of the RCCA.

We further urge that the House review and consider a similar disapproval resolution for the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Amendment Act of 2022 which was enacted by the City Council on 19 January 2023 without Mayor Bowser's signature. Under the guise of police reform, the Act attacks the rights of D.C. law enforcement officers, including restricting their right to bargain collectively and destroying their ability to challenge disciplinary matters taken without just cause. The law is anti-police, pro-crime, and the leading reason for the exodus of officers from the MPD. Like the RCCA, it will make the District of Columbia more dangerous for citizens who live in the District, individuals who work in the District, and tourists visiting the District. As a result, the D.C. Police Union respectfully requests your assistance in defeating these horrible laws.

On behalf of the more than 364,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we strongly urge all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support and pass H.J. Res. 26 to protect the safety of the public in Washington, D.C. If I can provide any additional information about this bill, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in our Washington, D.C. office.

Sincerely,

PATRICK YOES,  
National President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
POLICE ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,  
Alexandria, VA, February 7, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,

Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,

Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER MCCARTHY AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: On behalf of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO) and the over 241,000 sworn law enforcement officers we represent across the country, I am writing to advise you of our concerns with the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022 (D.C. Act 24-789), as enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia on January 17, 2023, and our subsequent support for H.J. Res. 26.

According to the Metropolitan Police Department's crime data, from this time last year, the District of Columbia has experienced an increase in homicides, carjackings, and theft. Particularly, D.C. is amid a rise in gun violence and homicide rates among the city's youth. Yet, the Council still voted to enact the revised criminal code that lowers penalties for the crimes most impacting the city and its residents, including carjacking, illegal firearm possession, and robbery, and it will eliminate almost all mandatory minimum sentences.

Proponents of the Revised Code believe that it will ensure that sentences better fit their crimes and will give nonviolent, low risk offenders a chance to become productive

members of society. While NAPO agrees that these are laudable goals—to ensure the punishment fits the crime—we disagree on how this law accomplishes those goals. We continue to believe that mandatory minimums are a strong deterrent for criminals and an important tool in helping law enforcement keep our communities safe from violent crime.

In addition, the Revised Code significantly changes the law of self-defense for law enforcement officers that would considerably constrain an officer's ability to protect themselves and the public when confronted with imminent death. Under the Revised Code, the considerations the officer must make when faced with the need to use deadly force are not only unrealistic in the rapidly unfolding scenario of an attack upon an officer, they also create the perverse situation where a suspect who escalates his/her dangerous behavior toward an officer, to the point of deadly force being an option, is more likely to be let go than a less-violent suspect.

NAPO is concerned that the Revised Criminal Code Act, if allowed to be enacted into law, will decrease public safety and leave crime victims in a continual search for justice. Therefore, we support H.J. Res. 26, disapproving of the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022, so that the Council of the District of Columbia can work with Mayor Muriel Bowser to revise the criminal code in a way that will not benefit violent criminals over victims and will make the city safer.

We appreciate your consideration of our concerns with the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022. If we can provide any assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JOHNSON, ESQ.,  
*Executive Director.*

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT  
OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, February 7, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
*Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER MCCARTHY, I am writing on behalf of the almost 32,000 members of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA) to express our strong support for H.J. Res. 26, "Disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022."

In the past several years, there has been a dramatic increase in multiple categories of violent crime, including murders, homicides, robberies, aggravated assaults and carjackings. Areas across the United States are experiencing this heightened level of violent crime, with much violence being highly concentrated in lower socioeconomic and minority communities. These residents should not need to live in fear for their safety.

So far in 2023, Washington D.C. is experiencing a 29 percent increase in homicides, an 89 percent increase in motor vehicle thefts, and an overall 18 percent increase in total crime. These statistics are shocking for any community, but particularly shameful for our nation's capital city.

The primary goal of community leaders should be to provide law enforcement the effective tools to counter and prevent violent criminal activity. As proposed, the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022 ties the hands of our law enforcement professionals. Therefore, FLEOA strongly supports this resolution disapproving of the Revision Criminal Code.

We are grateful for your leadership on this issue and your efforts to ensure that all law enforcement officers nationwide have the

ability to serve and protect the American public.

Sincerely,

LARRY COSME,  
*National President, Federal Law*  
*Enforcement Officers Association.*

□ 1015

Mr. COMER. The D.C. Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022 is irresponsible. It is dangerous. It is playing with the livelihoods of all who live in or visit D.C. by gutting the local justice system and allowing emboldened criminals to remain on the streets.

This Congress must swiftly exercise its constitutional role concerning the District of Columbia and reject this misguided legislation from going into effect.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to unite in support of law and order and support this necessary resolution of disapproval.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I condemn H. Res. 26 in the strongest terms, which seeks to nullify the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022, enacted by the council of the District of Columbia (DC). This bill is nothing more than a naked power grab on the part of House Republicans to enforce the will of Congress on the duly elected local representatives of the District of Columbia. I approach the subject of home rule as a former local government official having served on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors for 14 years, including five as chairman and as a former chairman of the Council of Governments. I know what it takes to manage public safety. I cannot imagine how a local government can function efficiently or effectively, if each of its public safety decisions requires Congressional approval. I have consistently supported autonomy for the District and would argue Congress' actions have actually had a deleterious effect on the District and its residents. D.C.'s lack of autonomy affects the entire National Capital Region, especially the thousands of my constituents who are civil servants and work in the District. I hope the irony of this situation is not lost on those who support the conservative principles of limited government and states' rights. Let me remind my colleagues of what my fellow Virginian, James Madison, said in the *Federalist Papers*, Number 43, with respect to the intent of the Congressional authority. In referring to the residents of this federal District, Madison said "they will have had their voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes." There is no more basic exercise of municipal authority than protecting public safety.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 26, a resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022.

This resolution is not only a brazen and misguided measure seeking to uphold decades of racially systemic policies of criminal injustice, it is an insulting attempt to trample on the rights and the will of the people in the District of Columbia.

By subjecting thousands of Black residents of Washington, D.C. to criminalization and incarceration, the Revised Criminal Code Act of

2022 was the first comprehensive revision of the D.C. code since the year 1901, something that should've been revised long before.

However, in contrast to the majority of other states, D.C. did not update its criminal statutes throughout the 1960s and 1970s.

As a result of the antiquated laws, which had been in place for decades, the human rights and freedoms of Washingtonians has been compromised, resulting in D.C. having one of the highest imprisonment rates in the nation, whereby Black males account for more than 95% of those who are behind bars.

The 2022 revision was a necessary push forward, and for the Republicans within this congress to attempt to undo these revisions, shows a rejection of Home Rule.

The revisions helped to correct many of the faults that the District of Columbia continuously ran into with the district itself making the necessary corrections with the support of the public.

The D.C. Criminal Code Reform Commission was formed by the D.C. Council to revise the statutes to guarantee that the revisions of offenses and punishments are precise, consistent, reasonable, and constitutional.

The District of Columbia Public Defender Service, the District of Columbia Attorney General, legal professionals, and the general public were among the sources of input that the Commission consulted.

Members of Congress should not use their own policy judgment to replace that of the elected officials within D.C.

Prior to these revisions simple assault carried a sentence of less than six months in prison, while the threat of simple assault carried a 20-year sentence.

Possession of self-defense spray and possession of a fully automatic machine gun carried the same maximum penalty of one year.

Some offenses can be traced back to the District's Black Codes and Slave Codes and others that were introduced by segregationists from states outside D.C.

The almost 700,000 individuals who live in Washington, D.C., are capable of self-government and through the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022, proved themselves as such.

Congress is not judge, jury and executioner and should not overstep its place within Washington, D.C. Washington, D.C. has its sole right to govern its jurisdiction and citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 97, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

# ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

## CONDEMNING THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY'S USE OF A HIGH-ALTITUDE SURVEILLANCE BALLOON OVER UNITED STATES TERRITORY AS A BRAZEN VIOLATION OF UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 104) condemning the Chinese Communist Party's use of a high-altitude surveillance balloon over United States territory as a brazen violation of United States sovereignty.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

### H. RES. 104

Whereas, on February 2, 2023, the Department of Defense publicly announced it was tracking over United States territory a high-altitude surveillance balloon belonging to the People's Republic of China (PRC);

Whereas the Department of Defense has since acknowledged that North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) first began tracking the surveillance balloon on January 28, 2023, prior to its entry into United States airspace;

Whereas the Secretary of Defense has stated that the balloon "was being used by the PRC in an attempt to surveil strategic sites in the continental United States";

Whereas the surveillance balloon traveled near sensitive United States national security facilities, including Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana;

Whereas, on February 4, 2023, a United States Air Force aircraft shot down the surveillance balloon off the coast of South Carolina;

Whereas the Chinese Communist Party's (CCP) intelligence collection directed against the United States poses a threat to United States interests and security;

Whereas, while the PRC has a long history of intelligence collection operations against United States national security entities, reports of its espionage have risen significantly in recent years;

Whereas the CCP attempted to spread false claims about the nature and purpose of the surveillance balloon, falsely claiming it to be a weather balloon that veered off-course due to "force majeure" events;

Whereas, on February 3, 2023, the Secretary of State postponed his planned trip to the PRC and referred to the balloon incident as an "irresponsible act and a clear violation of U.S. sovereignty and international law that undermined the purpose of the trip";

Whereas Article I of the Convention on International Civil Aviation, also known as the Chicago Convention, states that "every State has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory";

Whereas although PRC surveillance balloons have previously violated United States

airspace, this incident differs from those prior violations due to the length of time the balloon spent over United States territory; and

Whereas it is in the United States national security interest to deter foreign adversaries from engaging in intelligence collection and other malign activities within United States territory and airspace: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the PRC's brazen violation of United States sovereignty;

(2) denounces the CCP's efforts to deceive the international community through false claims about its intelligence collection campaigns in violation of United States sovereignty;

(3) determines that it should be the policy of the United States to promptly and decisively act to prevent foreign aerial surveillance platforms, including those directed by or connected to the CCP, from violating United States sovereignty; and

(4) calls on the Biden administration to continue to keep Congress apprised by providing comprehensive briefings on this incident that include—

(A) a complete account of all known infiltrations of the national airspace by the PRC over the past several years, regardless of platform;

(B) a complete account of similar past incidents of the PRC's use of surveillance balloons around the world;

(C) a complete timeline of events for the most recent infiltration from first detection to the eventual shootdown of the balloon;

(D) an assessment of what surveillance data the PRC was potentially able to collect or transmit, via the balloon while it was over United States territory;

(E) a detailed account of what measures were taken to mitigate the intelligence collection threat posed by the balloon, the costs of those measures, and the impact on the regular operations of the affected installations, platforms, and personnel;

(F) a description of what options were identified to mitigate the threat, and a description and timing of the recommendation the U.S. military made to the President regarding those response options;

(G) a detailed account of diplomatic communications between the United States and the PRC regarding this incident, including any demarches by Department of State personnel and subsequent responses by the PRC; and

(H) a detailed description of plans, capabilities, and methods to deter and defeat intelligence collection activities conducted by the PRC or other foreign adversaries in the national airspace system and any additional authorities needed from Congress to ensure detection and defeat of these activities in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCAUL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this past week the Nation watched in shock as a Chinese surveillance balloon traversed much of the United States, including sensitive American military sites like Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana. That base is one of the three places where our minuteman ICBM nuclear missiles are stored.

Americans were rightfully deeply disturbed by this brazen violation of sovereignty by the Chinese Communist Party. This act of aggression was done on the eve of a scheduled meeting between Chairman Xi and Secretary of State Antony Blinken. That meeting was ultimately canceled.

The balloon, I believe, was a test, a test of this administration to see how it would respond. I believe the President should have shot it down before it entered American airspace rather than allow it to cross over the Continental United States airspace.

But make no mistake, this was another intentionally provocative act by the CCP. As I have said often, weakness invites aggression. This act will only further embolden and empower our enemies; it will embolden and empower Chairman Xi.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a foreign nation adversary fly a reconnaissance aircraft that you could see from the ground with your own eyes. The CCP threat is now within sight for Americans across the heartland, a vision and memory that they will not forget.

This is further proof that the CCP does not care about having a constructive relationship with the United States. It is publicly challenging U.S. interests, threatening Taiwan, supporting Russia's war of aggression in Ukraine, and now violating U.S. sovereignty.

If there is any question whether the administration should request funds supporting Taiwan's foreign military financing grants, this incident alone should make it clear that the time is now to harden ourselves and our partners against the Chinese military aggression.

An event like this, Mr. Speaker, must not happen again, and it cannot go unanswered. They only understand one thing and that is force, and that is projecting power; and we need to project power and force and strength against the Chinese Communist Party.

They must understand that we do desire peace, but infringing upon our sovereignty leads us down a dangerous path. Our adversaries must believe that any future incursion into American airspace by a spy balloon or any other vehicle will be met with decisive force, and that is why the House should pass this resolution.

The resolution, under section 4, does call for the Biden administration to continue to keep Congress apprised by providing comprehensive briefings on this incident that include—and there